REMARKS

Claims 1-4, 6-11, and 13-19 are pending in the application. Applicants respectfully request entry of the foregoing amendments prior to further examination. No new matter has been introduced. Acceptance is respectfully requested.

In their application as originally filed, Applicants' teach a method of providing a data store of people information. According to this method, unstructured information about individual people is automatically extracted from a global computer network and stored in a database. The database maintains two sets of data simultaneously for each individual: (1) automatically extracted data and (2) user-edited (automatically extracted) data. As suggested by data set (2), people named in the database are given access to their records so that they may edit their data. The people having access to the database, however, may not modify the automatically extracted data in data set (1). *See* Specification, page 16, lines 22-27. Also, when the "database production and maintenance system 40 extracts new data from the Web, system 40 replaces the old extracted data, but the user-edited data will remain." Specification, page 16, lines 27-28. Thus, both user-edited data and automatically extracted data reside simultaneously in the database. But data in one data set is protected from updates to data in the other data set.

Claims 1 and 6-7 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stuntebeck et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,065,016) ("Stuntebeck") in view of Brady et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,463,430) ("Brady"), and further in view of Schneck et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,314,409) ("Schneck").

According to MPEP §2143, "[t]o establish a prima facie case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, . . . to combine reference teachings. . . . The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination . . . must . . . be found in the prior art, not in applicant's disclosure. In re Vaeck, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991)." Moreover, "[t]he mere fact that references <u>can</u> be combined or modified does not render the resultant combination obvious unless the prior art also suggests the desirability of the combination. In re Mills, 916 F.2d 680, 16 USPQ2d 1430 (Fed. Cir. 1990)." MPEP §2143.01.

The Stuntebeck patent describes a universal directory service which "provides the communication addresses of individuals associated with numerous different institutions" (col. 1,

lines 6-7). The universal directory service can be accessed via different communications channels such as the internet, dial-up access, dedicated access, wireless access, voice access, and commercial on-line services (see Fig. 1). The universal directory service extracts people information by communicating with other servers such as (1) local directory servers, (2) on-line directory servers, (3) local database servers, and (4) white pages directory servers (see col. 2, lines 9-23). Users of the universal directory service may log on to the service and update their directory information (see col. 3, lines 52-55). Thus, Stuntebeck encourages allowing users to access their respective records for the purpose of editing the very data that is protected in Applicants' invention.

The Brady patent describes a method for automatically creating or updating a database of resumes and related documents. According to this method, a spider or web crawler retrieves relevant documents from a network and extracts information from the retrieved relevant documents and stores the extracted information in a database (see col. 8, lines 22-46). Brady, however, does not describe automatically updating a database so that user-edited extracted information remains protected.

The Schneck patent describes a method and device for controlling access to protected portions of data in accordance with rules. The rules concern access rights to the protected portions of the data.

None of the cited references promote that automatic extracted data should be protected data as in the present invention.

Further, there is no suggestion or motivation in Stuntebeck, Brady or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Stuntebeck and Brady to provide the maintaining, for each individual, of both (1) automatically extracted data and (2) user-edited data simultaneously. Stuntebeck allows a user to update their extracted directory information. Brady provides a method for automatically extracting unstructured information from documents on a network and updating a database with that information. However, neither Stuntebeck, Brady, nor the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art suggests that Stuntebeck be combined with Brady to provide the maintaining, for each individual, of both (1) automatically extracted data and (2) user-edited data simultaneously as claimed in now amended Claim 1 ("both user-edited data and automatically extracted information reside simultaneously in the database").

Claim 1 has further been amended to make clear that portions of the user-edited data may include the same information as the automatically extracted data but a different version of the automatically extracted data ("portions of the user-edited data being the same information but possibly different version of the automatically extracted information"). No combination of the cited references suggest such multiple versions of the same information maintained as in the present claimed invention.

In addition, there is no suggestion or motivation in Stuntebeck, Brady, Schneck or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Stuntebeck, Brady and Schneck to provide for protecting data in one data set (e.g., automatically extracted data) from updates to data in the other data set (e.g., user-edited data) as claimed in now amended Claim 1 ("maintains integrity of the automatically extracted information . . . the automated means replacing old extracted data but not user-edited data with newly extracted data"). In fact, Stuntebeck teaches away from the claimed maintaining the automatically extracted data as "protected data." Stuntebeck encourages allowing users to access their respective records for the purpose of editing the very data that is protected in Applicants' invention. In sum, Stuntebeck fails to suggest the desirability of combining it with Schneck (and Brady) to produce Applicants' invention.

Since a prima facie case of obviousness has not been established with respect to now amended Claim 1, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 1 be withdrawn.

Since a prima facie case of obviousness has not been established with respect to now amended base Claim 1, dependent Claims 6 and 7 are allowable for the same reasons. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of dependent Claims 6 and 7 be withdrawn.

Claims 2 and 8 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stuntebeck in view of Brady and Schneck, and further in view of Robertson (U.S. Pat. No. 6,269,369).

Robertson provides a network-computer-based personal contact manager system. Users maintain and update their user information which is stored in a database on a networked server. Users may specify which of their contacts are permitted to access certain data of their user information. The system issues notifications (e.g., by e-mail) to the user's contacts when the user changes his information or when a preset event defined by the user occurs. For example, a User A may enter an address change (see Fig. 14). If User B is a contact of User A, then the personal contact manager issues an update notification to User B's computer and User A's address change

is downloaded to User B's computer (see col. 16, lines 2-7). Software on User B's computer is then updated with the changed information.

As argued above, a prima facie case of obviousness has not been established with respect to now amended base Claim 1. Robertson does not add to Stuntebeck, Brady and Schneck the feaature of maintaining the integrity of (1) automatically extracted data and (2) user-edited data residing simultaneously in a database, where portions of the user-edited data are the same information, but possibly different version of the automatically extracted information, as recited in now amended base Claim 1. Therefore, dependent Claims 2 and 8 are allowable for the same reasons. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of dependent Claims 2 and 8 be withdrawn.

Claims 3, 4, 9, 12, and 14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stuntebeck in view of Brady and Schneck, and further in view of Polnerow et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,813,006) ("Polnerow"). Claim 12 is cancelled.

Similar to Stuntebeck, Polnerow provides an online directory that allows registered users to access and edit their respective listing in the online directory.

As argued above, a prima facie case of obviousness has not been established with respect to now amended base Claim 1. Polnerow does not promote the treatment of automatically extracted data as protected data as in the present invention. Specifically, Polmerow does not add to Stuntebeck, Brady, and Schneck the feature of maintaining the integrity of (1) automatically extracted data and (2) user-edited data residing simultaneously in a database as recited in now amended base Claim 1. Therefore, dependent Claims 3 and 4 are allowable for the same reasons. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of dependent Claims 3 and 4 be withdrawn.

Independent Claim 9 includes and has been amended to include similar limitations as now amended independent Claim 1 ("maintains integrity of the automatically extracted information such that both user-edited data and automatically extracted information reside simultaneously in the database ... the automated means replacing old extracted data but not user-edited data with newly extracted data, portions of the user-edited data being the same information but possibly different version of the automatically extracted information"). Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 9 be withdrawn for at least the same reasons.

Since Claim 14 depends from now amended base Claim 9, Claim 14 is allowable for the same reasons. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 14 be withdrawn for at least the same reasons.

Claims 10 and 13 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stuntebeck in view of Brady, Schneck and Polnerow, and further in view of Robertson.

Since Claims 10 and 13 depend from now amended base Claim 9, they are allowable for the same reasons given above with respect to Claim 9. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 10 and 13 be withdrawn.

Claims 11 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stuntebeck in view of Brady, Schneck, Polnerow and Robertson, and further in view of Celik (U.S. Pat. No. 6,654,768).

Celik provides a method and apparatus for storing and retrieving business contact information in an internet-accessible database. Celik allows a user to edit her business contact information stored in the database. Celik does not add to Stuntebeck, Brady, Schneck, Polnerow, and Robertson the protection of automatically extracted data or the maintenance of the integrity of (1) automatically extracted data and (2) user-edited data residing simultaneously in a database as recited in now amended base Claim 9. Since Claim 11 depends from now amended base Claim 9, Claim 11 is allowable for the same reasons. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of dependent Claim 11 be withdrawn.

Claims 15, 16, and 19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stuntebeck in view of Brady, and further in view of Robertson.

First, Robertson in any combination with Stuntebeck and Brady does not teach, suggest, or otherwise make obvious the claimed ". . . (ii) notifying an interested party of said detected change . . . wherein the interested party includes the at least one person..." as now recited in base Claim 15. That is, Robertson does not teach detecting from a global computer network a change in a person's information and then notifying that same person of the detected changes found in the global computer network. To the contrary, Robertson teaches a system that issues notifications to contacts of a user when that user changes his information or when a preset event occurs (e.g., birthday).

Second, there is no suggestion or motivation in Stuntebeck, Brady, Robertson or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Stuntebeck, Brady, and Robertson to provide for (a) monitoring the global computer network for changes in

information about a person with respect to extracted information stored in a database, (b) notifying an interested party, including the person, of detected changes in information, and (c) corresponding this new information to the extracted information stored in the database. Both Stuntebeck and Brady provide the directory-type services of extracting and storing information about people and allowing users to access that information (e.g., to update user information or search for information). The directory-type services provided by Stuntebeck and Brady are very different from the personal contact managing services provided by Robertson. Robertson allows users to share their personal information, in part or in whole, with other specified users (see, e.g., col. 2, lines 47-50). For example, when a user changes her information, the personal contact manager notifies other specified users of those changes. Further, such contacts data is not extracted information (from a global computer network) stored in a database in contrast to the present invention. Therefore, it would not have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to combine in any way the teachings of Stuntebeck, Brady, and Robertson to provide for "monitoring the global computer network for changes in information about desired people or organizations . . . and in response to said monitoring (i) detecting a change in information about at least one person, (ii) notifying an interested party of said detected change . . . wherein the interested party includes the at least one person" and " . . .(iv) replacing old extracted information . . . stored in the database with the new information. . ." as claimed in independent Claim 15 as now amended. Because a prima facie case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) has not been established, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of independent Claim 15 be withdrawn.

Since Claims 16 and 19 depend from base Claim 15, they are allowable for the same reasons. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 16 and 19 be withdrawn.

Claims 17 and 18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stuntebeck in view of Brady and Robertson, and further in view of Polnerow.

Since Claims 17 and 18 depend from base Claim 15, they are allowable for the same reasons argued above with respect to Claim 15. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 17 and 18 be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that all pending claims (Claims 1-4, 6-11 and 13-19) are in condition for allowance, and it is respectfully requested that the application be passed to issue. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this case, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH & REYNOLDS, P.C.

By _____

Mary Lou Wakimura
Registration No. 31,804
Telephone: (978) 341-0036
Facsimile: (978) 341-0136

Concord, MA 01742-9133
Dated: 8/30/05